



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,142	02/06/2004	Mayuko Yoshida	60811 (49381)	8256
21874	7590	12/11/2007		
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 55874			PARK, CHAN S	
BOSTON, MA 02205			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/774,142	Applicant(s) YOSHIDA ET AL.	
	Examiner CHAN S. PARK	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Douglas Q. Tran

Chan S. Park

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/6/04</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. With respect to claim 1, the claim recites the limitation "data distributing means for distributing said data to either the first storage section or the second storage section". It is unclear if said data already stored in the first storage section is analyzed and distributed to either the first storage section or the second storage section.

Explanation/clarification from the Specification is respectfully requested.

2. Claim 3 recites the limitation "said data" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is unclear if this data is referring to the said data stored in the first storage section or the second storage section. Furthermore, it is unclear if the data having a data property of confidentiality recited claim 2 is set to be confidential again according to claim 3. Explanation/clarification from the Specification is respectfully requested.

3. Claim 5 recites the limitation "said data" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is unclear if this data is referring to the said data stored in the first storage section or the second storage section. Furthermore, it is unclear if the data having a data property of confidentiality recited claim 2 is set to be

confidential again according to claim 5. Explanation/clarification from the Specification is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Parry U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0095284.

4. With respect to claims 1, Parry discloses a data processing apparatus (imaging device 110 in fig. 1) which performs output processing on plural pieces of data (outputting the print-ready format files by the translator 125 in paragraph 14) having distinct data properties (user-defined operations in paragraph 18), in respective forms corresponding to the data properties, and which comprises storage means for storing said data having undergone said output processing (storage having appropriate directories for storing the translated files in paragraph 18), wherein said storage means comprises:

a first storage section for storing said data (first directory for storing the files according to the file type in paragraphs 18 & 23);

a second storage section (second directory for storing the files having the PIN in paragraphs 18 & 23) for storing corresponding data into respective storage regions partitioned (note that each associated PIN has respective regions for storing its respective print jobs) in correspondence to said data properties (paragraphs 18 & 23); and

data distributing means for distributing said data to either the first storage section or the second storage section depending on the data property (note that processor is acting as the memory controller for distributing the translated files to appropriate directories according to the user-defined operations in paragraphs 18 & 23).

5. With respect to claim 2, Parry discloses a data processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said data distributing means distributes data having a data property of confidentiality (PIN) to the second storage section (second directory for storing the files having the PIN in paragraphs 18 & 23).

6. With respect to claim 9, Parry discloses a data processing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said data distributing means is a memory controller connected to said first storage section and said second storage section (note that processor is acting as the memory controller for distributing the translated files to appropriate directories according to the user-defined operations in paragraphs 18 & 23).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Keane et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0215525 (hereinafter Keane).

7. With respect to claim 3, Parry discloses the data processing apparatus according to claim 2, comprising: confidentiality setting means for setting said data to be confidential (the files having the PIN in paragraphs 18 & 23). Note that these files are set to be confidential at the printer since the files can only be retrieved upon user entering the PIN codes (paragraph 22).

Parry, however, does not explicitly disclose the condition setting means for setting a retention condition or a deletion condition of data in each data job when said data is set to be confidential.

Keane, the same field of endeavor of retaining files/print jobs in the directory, discloses a condition setting means for setting retention condition or a deletion condition of the file (the number of days to keep the file in the database in paragraph 120 & fig. 28).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of setting the retention and/or deletion condition as taught by Keane into the printing system of Parry.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to manage the stored files/print jobs and to prevent from retaining the old files/print jobs for a long time.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Parry with Keane to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

8. With respect to claim 4, the combination of Parry and Keane discloses the data processing apparatus according to claim 3, comprising:

inputting means for inputting the number of days as the deletion condition of said data;

calendar detecting means for detecting the date corresponding to said inputted days; and

data deleting means for deleting said data when the date corresponding to said inputted days is detected (paragraph 120 & fig. 28 of Keane).

Keane, however, does not explicitly disclose the date inputting means for inputting a date as the deletion condition of said data.

However, since designating a specific date via a GUI is well known technique in the art, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the inputting means of Keane to reflect the date inputting display.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide another way to specify the deletion date of the said data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Rice U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0174010.

9. With respect to claim 5, Parry discloses the data processing apparatus according to claim 2, comprising: confidentiality setting means for setting said data to be confidential (the files having the PIN in paragraphs 18 & 23). Note that these files are set to be confidential at the printer since the files can only be retrieved upon user entering the PIN codes (paragraph 22).

Parry, however, does not explicitly disclose the determination level inputting means for inputting a determination level depending on the level of the secrecy or importance of said data when said data is set to be confidential.

Rice, the same field of endeavor of retaining files in the directory for later access, discloses the determination level inputting means for inputting a determination level depending on the level of the secrecy or importance of directory (setting different security classification for each directory in paragraph 133).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the setting the security level to the directory as taught by Rice into the printing system of Parry.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to regulate the directory access via the web server 120 (paragraph 20 of Parry) depending on the security level.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Parry with Rice to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Parry and Rice as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Keane.

10. With respect to claim 6, the combination discloses the data processing apparatus according to claim 5, wherein said determination level is those classified into a plurality of classes (paragraph 133 of Rice).

The combination, however, does not explicitly disclose deletion condition setting means for setting a deletion condition for deleting said data in each of said classes; and automatic deleting means for deleting said data automatically when said deletion condition is satisfied.

Keane, the same field of endeavor of retaining files/print jobs in the directory, discloses a condition setting means for setting retention condition or a deletion condition of the file (the number of days to keep the file in the database in paragraph 120 & fig. 28).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of setting the retention and/or deletion condition as taught by Keane into the printing system of Parry.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to manage the stored files/print jobs and to prevent from retaining the old files/print jobs for a long time.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claim 8 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


Contact Information

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAN S. PARK whose telephone number is (571) 272-7409. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

csp
November 28, 2007


DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Chan S. Park
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

